



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

What she is, she will be. It would, therefore, seem to be true that the more thoroughly we do our social case work, the more we are going to break away from repressive personal controls and get out into the broader fields that lie in education, health, recreation and proper training of children during early years.

We speak of long continued supervision as a necessary accompaniment of good social case work. Each social worker knows from actual experience, however, that with new work coming on day by day we do not possess the workers or the funds to give this suggested type of supervision to more than an infinitesimal number of mothers.

Moreover, as we study our social case work material through periods sufficiently long, we shall see that, if the mothers are of normal mentalities the major part of the burden of readjustment rests on their shoulders. Social case work, therefore, applied to the field of illegitimacy is going to supply that fund of information the lack of which we are only beginning to sense. Knowledge here will surely mean power—power that will lead us to a more economical use of resources and equipment so that by careful work with all growing children we may prepare more of them for the opportunities and privileges of a deliberate and responsible parenthood.

The Development of Social Work for Child Protection

By C. C. CARSTENS, PH.D.

Director of the Child Welfare League of America

THE field of social work for children is extensive and complex. Perhaps no other has as many ramifications that cross over into other fields. In no other, have more specialties been developed.

In spite of the varieties of services which are included in this field, the various divisions have on the whole had a steady and untroubled course of development. Institutional care of children, child-placing, juvenile probation and infant welfare have all come into public recognition, have found each its province in relation to the rest and have developed coöperative relations with the other social agencies with which they came in active contact, all with little friction, controversy or discussion. The newer arrivals in the children's field, such as the visiting teacher, the vocational guide and the child-health visitor seem to find an appreciative clientèle and are establishing

their permanent relationships without difficulty.

The child protection movement alone of all the specialties, seems to be a field full of divisive controversy. The nature of its work is so vital to the maintenance of the family tie that the agencies of the movement have had to shape definite, consistent and well thought out policies and to defend them vigorously. When the child is unable to get the proper protection in its own home, children's protective agencies have not hesitated to ask the courts as a last resort to cut the family tie. This course is so abhorrent to certain people who do not realize the menace that a brutal parent or an immoral home may prove both to the child and to the welfare of the community, that it often becomes the subject of bitter legal and public controversy.

Not only have children's protective societies felt the effects of controversy

with their outside critics, but there has also been a very definite diversity of opinions within their own ranks. This diversity is expressed both by holding a different conception of their functions and by adopting a difference in social procedure. The differences, indeed, are so fundamental that the public should know the principles involved, and so take its part in intelligent action at the proper time.

The formal children's protective work is at present vested in large measure with societies for the prevention of cruelty to children and with humane societies. Agencies, both public and private, with other designations also share in a limited way.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE MOVEMENT

Societies for the legal protection of animals have been in existence in England since 1824¹ and in America since 1866²; but it was not until 1875 that the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children was incorporated, the first of its kind, and, strangely, promoted first by those interested in the legal protection of animals.

The New York Society very quickly proved its usefulness. An intelligent and vigorous group of men took an active part in its development. It gained financial and moral support. More effective laws for the protection of children were urged and, on the basis of its experience, placed upon the statute books. It became a powerful instrument, under private auspices, for the enforcement of law and came to be wholesomely feared by the evil-doer.

The establishment of this society was only the beginning of the child

protection movement. In the same year similar societies were organized in Rochester, New York, Newburgh, New York, and every year for many years additional societies took up the work.

Before 1875 humane societies had previously been organized in many cities, that had the protection of animals, old people and prisoners as parts of their programs, with varying proportions of interest. Most of these now added the protection of children to their already quite diverse activities. This work has, however, never become a very important part of the program of humane societies although there are certain notable exceptions, such as those in Cleveland and Cincinnati. With this limitation, the child protection movement in America is represented at the present time by about five hundred societies and branch agencies scattered throughout the United States and Canada.³ England has a very well equipped society and others are found in her various dominions, notably India, and in other countries of Europe.

THE NEW YORK SOCIETY

The efficiency of the New York Society in law enforcement set a standard among the various agencies which most of them for many years in more or less halting fashion have imitated. But beside setting a standard in efficiency, it laid upon the whole movement its own interpretation of function which has proved to be narrowing.

In the minds of its founders, the New York Society was to be an organization for the enforcement of law. It did not concern itself with the causes which lead to tragedy in the child's life or with their removal except as might be incidental to the individual

¹ In 1824 the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was founded in London.

² In 1866 the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was founded in New York.

³ In Canada the children's aid societies with government subventions carry on children's protective work.

case. The Society was primarily concerned with the rescue of the child suffering from brutal treatment and living in degrading surroundings, and it presented such evidence to the court that those guilty might feel the heavy hand of the law. This view came to be best expressed and crystallized in a decision handed down by the New York Court of Appeals, January 9, 1900. The New York State Board of Charity had sought to extend its supervision over the work of the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children because it was charged by law with such supervision of the work of private organizations undertaking charitable work and particularly, charitable agencies receiving public funds. Since the New York Society had received \$30,000 in the year 1898 from the treasury of the City of New York and since the State Board of Charity considered that agency a charity, it sought to perform its duty by inspecting the Society's building and shelter for children and by supervising its finances and its work. The New York Society thereupon brought suit to prevent the Board from performing such inspection and supervision, on the ground that the Society was not a charity. The Appellate Division of the Supreme Court held it was a charity, and the New York Society appealed to the Court of Appeals which reversed the decision by a vote of 4 to 3.⁴

In the course of his decision Judge O'Brien stated that the "corporation (New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children) was created for the purpose of enforcing laws enacted to prevent cruelty to children and that is the only object or purpose of its existence"; and Judge Gray added in his comment, "giving it a distinct place from those institutions which being of a charitable, eleemosynary, correctional

and reformatory nature, are made subject to the authority of the State Board."

To this interpretation of its function the New York Society has consistently clung all these years, until very recently. In the Annual Report of the General Manager of the New York Society for 1919 there appears for the first time in its publications an indication of the broadening of its program. This significant passage reads as follows:

The assistance and supervision rendered by the Society in the rehabilitation of homes has continued to be a most gratifying feature of its work. Children are removed from the custody of their parents or guardians only when such action has become imperative, and, in every case, effort is made to encourage in the guardians a proper sense of their responsibility and a determination to reconstruct their homes upon a better standard, in order that their children may be returned to them. Every effort is made to save the children to their homes.⁵

The restricted policy of the New York Society because of its clear-cut form of statement and its preëminence in size and quality of enforcement service, set the pace for most if not all other organizations of this kind. But even when following the policy of the New York Society in general, there were those which conceived their function in the protection of children more broadly and did not hesitate to be called charities or to be supervised by the agents of boards of charities, even if such supervision implied acknowledgment of doing charitable work.

THE MASSACHUSETTS SOCIETY

From the First Annual Report of the Massachusetts Society for the Preven-

⁵ Annual Report of the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, 1919, p. 23-24.

⁴ 161 New York Reports, p. 233.

tion of Cruelty to Children⁶ we quote the following:

The Society is not limited to checking actual cases of abuse and neglect by rescuing the children or punishing the offenders. It aims to inculcate better ideas of child government and in this its efforts are not confined to the brutal classes.

One of our methods of relieving children is to reform the parents. . . . The parents are put on probation, recognizing always the parental rights, and the fact that institution life is not the natural life for children and does not fit them for the best manhood and womanhood. When the home life is not degraded, or can be essentially improved, it is better not to separate parent and child.

The Massachusetts Society did not consistently develop this point of view which was expressed so early in its existence. In common with many others it was largely influenced in its development by the New York Society. Its law enforcement as a consequence became its most important function for many years. In spite of this, its policies did not require such a rigid separation from relations with all other social effort as the New York Society urged and cultivated. During the last fifteen years there has been a more marked divergence, and the preventive and constructive phases of child protection have come strongly to the front in its program. In this same period of time, other children's protective agencies have also recognized more clearly the importance of the preventive phases of their programs. Among those showing this tendency most strongly are the societies in Philadelphia, Brooklyn, Newark, Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Minneapolis and more latterly, Cincinnati.

⁶ Annual Report of Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, 1881, *pp.* 20 and 22.

RESTRICTIONISTS VS. LIBERALS

These two interpretations have led to much controversy within the membership of the children's protective movement. The restrictionists have maintained a separate annual meeting in connection with the American Humane Association, a day and a half being set apart for the discussion of subjects relating to the protection of children, while the rest of the time is given to the discussion of animal protection. The liberal wing, which is still small but seems to be growing in numbers, is, on the other hand, allying itself actively with the Children's Division of the National Conference of Social Work, because there only does it get an opportunity to interpret its principles to thousands of social workers who are actively interested in the protection of children and who are daily working for their betterment.

These diverse positions have led to many other more important diversities in development. The restrictionist group, considering themselves, first of all, agents for law enforcement, have recruited their paid personnel from the ranks of truant officers, deputy sheriffs, constables, poor officials or other public agents. This is particularly true where the work done is not extensive and only part of the time of the official is taken for the children's protective service. Such limitations in the personnel tend to emphasize a restricted program, with the result that in many cities and states the children's work of humane societies is so limited in extent, viewpoint and effectiveness that the citizens either do not know that it exists or have ceased to depend upon it for tangible results.

PRESENT STATUS OF THE MOVEMENT

There are no reliable statistics showing the extent of children's protective

work in America, but an intimate acquaintance with the history and extent of the movement leads the writer to the conclusion that this service, which is largely under private control, is being increasingly supported from the public purse and that if public subventions should cease, many of the "humane officers," in whose hands rests the protection of children of the nation, would close their offices and seek other jobs. A large majority of the five hundred or more societies have not now and probably never have had the financial backing or support to maintain themselves by private contributions and income from investments. In a number of states humane societies receive part of their support from fines imposed by the courts and from fees.⁷ Many of the children's protective societies listed by the American Humane Association do not respond to letters and have become "inactive." It may be inferred from this and other reports that a considerable number included in this list are not functioning actively in child protection or are largely paper organizations.

This is not a very satisfactory prospect for the protection of the children of the nation. The program of the New York Society appealed to the imagination and humanity of thinking people of the decade after the Civil War. A number of strong societies sprang up, prospered and have continued to render good service in this field, but the precarious existence of the movement in most parts of the country is ample cause for serious consideration by philanthropist and ordinary citizen as to what the future of the movement shall be.

The New York Society deals with about 18,000 neglected children a year, and the Massachusetts Society, being organized on a state-wide basis, with

about 15,000. City and country both seem to furnish their quota of neglected children and there are few communities where some active work for their protection is not needed.

PROTECTION OF CHILDREN A PUBLIC DUTY

In all of our states, public provision has been made for the protection and training of delinquent children and in many of them the state is beginning to recognize its public responsibility in the care of children who have become dependent through poverty, sickness or other accidents of life. These states, either directly or through county units, furnish assistance to good mothers to maintain their children with them or provide the children with institutional or family care.

Important as this work is, the protection of children from brutal parents and from degrading surroundings is equally a public duty which states cannot continue to shirk without endangering their moral welfare and their financial prosperity. It is an accepted fact that the prevention of delinquency is largely a prevention of juvenile delinquency. And it can be equally well shown that it is the poorly functioning home that provides the conditions out of which come a very considerable proportion of our delinquent boys and girls. This is the stake that each intelligent community holds in tactful, persistent and energetic child protection. Here and there evidence may be found that child protection is thought of as a public function, such as the establishment of state departments for child and animal protection and state boards of children's guardians. The continuous appropriation of subventions to private children's protective societies can be interpreted only on the basis of their work's being considered a proper public function.

⁷ Dog taxes maintain a considerable number of humane officers in Ohio.

CHANGED EMPHASIS IN CHILD PROTECTION WORK

The first twenty-five cases reported by the New York Society might be analyzed as follows: Beating or other physical cruelty, 13; children begging and accompanying an organ grinder, 2; children sent out by parent or guardian to beg, 2; attempted assault, 2; abandonment of child, need of medical care, child found intoxicated, child living in immoral resort, father not supporting child, and commitment to institution without court action, 1 each. A little later the protection of little children from the cruelties attending the training of young acrobats became an important part of that society's work. These are all important tasks in the process of child protection. They were largely concerned with the physical care of the child. The less obtrusive and equally important services, to safeguard the child's training and morals, were but slightly represented; but these have now become the most important part of the program of any well equipped children's protective agency.

The brutal treatment of children has been much reduced, partly no doubt because of the work of children's protective agencies, and the more preventive phases have come to the front. An analysis of the case work of the Massachusetts Society in a recent year showed that only 6 per cent of its cases dealt with cruelty, which played such an important part a generation ago.

It is clear, then, that with the better comprehension of the dangers to child life, the program of child protection must necessarily broaden as well as become more fundamental. A community that would give its children who have not proper protection at home, the safeguards to which they are entitled, should have an agency with the

physical equipment and personnel commensurate with the task.

Child protection is rarely all done by a single agency. Often many public and private agencies contribute to the carrying out of a comprehensive program. It is customary, however, for the community to look to the children's protective society for the largest part of the work and for leadership, provided there is one in existence.

A PROGRAM FOR CHILD PROTECTION

In every community the following services must be rendered by some agency to ensure for all the children, "a square deal."

1. Children must be protected from physical brutalities. Though these are less numerous than before, they are always degrading even when not dangerous.

2. Children must be protected from early exhausting and degrading labor. The public now generally frowns upon the child acrobat, but child labor is still in great demand and seems in better standing since the War.

3. Children should receive suitable physical care at the hands of their parents and guardians. This includes proper medical and surgical care, recommended by physicians of standing in the community. While an honest difference of opinions is found on certain medical questions among medical men, children's protective agencies have rarely undertaken to enforce medical care where there was clear disagreement among practitioners of unquestioned standing.

4. Children, and particularly girls, need a vigorous agency in every community for their protection from early sex irregularities. The prosecuting attorneys of many communities are learning to render this protection, but in most places the prosecutions for sexual abuses to girls below the age of consent

are apt to be either futile because their testimony is poorly used or brutal and demoralizing to the girl witness. Courts should be required to modernize their procedure so as to give greater protection to the girl without removing reasonable safeguards for the accused.

5. Children should also be protected from immoral associations even where they are not directly concerned in immoral acts. This depends in large measure upon an active coöperation with the police departments of our communities. Most police officers are not appealed to in vain where the welfare of the child is involved, if they can see what it means to the child and if what is asked is legal and reasonable.

6. There may be a difference of opinion as to whether a man should support his wife under all circumstances, but there is none as to the responsibility of a father to support his children. To leave children dependent in a community is coming to be recognized as a crime whose effects are registered upon mind as well as body. The limitations which state lines bring to the enforcement of laws against abandonment and desertion are very serious. Perhaps a satisfactory solution of this problem will come only when the Federal Constitution makes it possible to enforce domestic relations in Federal Courts.

7. The child born out of wedlock needs an active agency in every community to safeguard his reasonable rights. Our communities are beginning to render this service, notably the state of Minnesota. One of the services is the enforcement of maintenance against the father, either by court action or by voluntary acknowledgment of paternity.

8. Crippled children and others suffering from physical or mental defects must be given all the opportunities and training that the science of medicine

and the art of education can provide, so that as far as possible they may become self-supporting citizens. Where this is impossible, they should have the protection of good public or private care. This does not preclude a good children's program from urging all reasonable measures for the elimination of the unfit.

9. Children should be protected from constant contact with habitual gamblers, drug users and criminals.

NEED FOR A PUBLIC CHILD PROTECTING AGENCY

But it is not enough that measures be taken for the enforcement of these standards, which are already largely expressed in the laws of our various states. Each one of our communities needs to have an agency that is alert to its changing needs in child protection and that, without running off on every possible tangent, will stand for a reasonable and well approved program. Such an agency would assist its community or state in becoming sensitive to children's needs, and would work with other agencies in the shaping and carrying forward of a complete social program for children who require intervention in their circumstances because of their own misfortune or the misfortune of their parents.

If this program is to be carried forward with any reasonable success over any considerable area, the state in its public capacity must step in to assume at least a part, and that, probably the largest part in the undertaking. Here and there certain of these tasks are already undertaken by a public agency. Boards of children's guardians in the District of Columbia and in West Virginia now include limited children's protective programs in their work.

The withdrawal of the Humane Society from the field of child protection has in certain cities led to the de-

velopment of a limited program of child protection in connection with certain active and well equipped juvenile courts. The Juvenile Court of Chicago is the best illustration of this tendency. But the juvenile court does not seem the logical place for locating this responsibility. The trend of child protection is toward an early recognition of menacing conditions. Instead of having most of its work adjusted by court action, a well equipped agency requires court action in a decreasing proportion. It is therefore more suitable to have such service rendered by a state agency with county or district units of service.

Just as in the care of dependent children private agencies are rendering a valuable supplemental service wherever a public agency has become active

in their care and placement, so in the field of child protection the private agencies can be equally valuable. Such private societies become experimenters, moulders of public opinion and anchors for the maintenance of good public ideals and standards.

The child protection movement of the humane societies has on the whole reached such a precarious position that it is no longer performing its public function in any adequate manner. A few strong societies, chiefly located in large cities, have met the need, but largely with a restricted program. It is of the utmost importance that a new public service in child protection should be created, or, where it has already begun, that it should be extended to give all unfortunate children "a square deal."

Problems of the Colored Child

By EUGENE KINCKLE JONES

Executive Secretary, National Urban League

IN public recognition Negroes represent a *class* as well as a *race*, and inherit the status fixed for both class and race divisions of our population. Without affirming any differences in instinct, racial traits or family structure, it is a fact that the problems of the colored child have special and distinct features. His problems are not only the regular and expected problems familiar to social workers given greater volume and intensity because of the economic class to which most colored children belong, but they are these problems further complicated by the circumstances of the Negro's social status, which limits his participation in the normal scheme of adjustment. With more than 70 per cent of the Negro population of ten years of age and over classed as wage earners and

over 70 per cent of these wage earners classed as unskilled, Negroes constitute an economic class upon which the burden of child rearing falls hardest. The factor of race intensifies these difficulties by the addition of others.

THE PROBLEM OF ILLITERACY

The heavy illiteracy rate among Negro children, especially in the South, is frequently taken as an evidence of native backwardness and parental indifference. Granted that both of these alleged causes are factors worthy of consideration, there is still a frightful inadequacy in school facilities which renders them insignificant deterrents by comparison. In 1910 the per cent of Negro illiterates ten years of age and over was 30.4. The percentages varied with the states from 7.9 per cent in